

externally of, the housing and are electrically connected to the control circuit.”

Cunkelman fails to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation of the Applicant’s claimed device as set forth in Claim 1 because it does not describe an apparatus that has all of the features of the Applicant’s claimed device. Claims 2 and 6 to 8 depend from Claim 1 either directly or indirectly and thus, include all of the features set forth in Claim 1. Therefore, Claims 2 and 6 to 8 are novel relative to Cunkelman for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 11 and 12

The Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 6,640,463 (Beck et al.). Applicant has reviewed the Beck et al. patent and believes that it fails to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation relative to Claims 11 and 12.

Beck et al. shows (Figs. 1 and 2) and describes air supply systems. The system shown in Fig. 1 has a dryer 14, valves 24 and 36, and respective electrical circuits. The system shown in Fig. 2 has a dryer 14, valves 58, 64, 50, and 46, and respective electrical circuits. However, there is no disclosure in Beck et al. of a housing for each of the electrical circuits shown in Figs. 1 and 2. Nor does the reference describe how the valves are mounted. Also, Beck et al. does not disclose the type of dryer that is illustrated in Figs. 1 and 2 (see Beck column 4, lines 45-48). More specifically, Becker et al. does not describe that the dryer 14 is a “pressure swing twin tower regenerative gas drier” as set forth in Claim 11.

In contrast, the Applicant’s claimed method as set forth in Claim 11 includes the step of using a housing within which an electronic control circuit is mounted and having at least two valves. The valves are provided with plugs or sockets that are adapted to cooperate with corresponding sockets or plugs in a wall of the housing so

that the valves are mounted externally on the housing. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 11 is directed to use of the housing on a pressure swing twin tower regenerative gas drier.

Beck et al. fails to present a *prima facie* case of anticipation of the Applicant's claimed device as set forth in Claim 11 because it does not describe a method or apparatus that has all of the steps or features of the Applicant's claimed method. Claim 12 depends from Claim 11 and thus, includes all of the features set forth in Claim 11. Therefore, Claims 12 is novel relative to Beck et al. for at least the same reasons as Claim 11.

35 USC § 103

Claim 3

The Examiner rejected Claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cunkelman in combination with US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175791 (LaMarca). The Examiner's proposed combination fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness even if the devices described in Cunkelman and LaMarca could somehow be combined.

Claim 3 depends from Claim 1, and, as discussed above, Cunkelman does not disclose all the features of Claim 1. LaMarca does not disclose the features of Claim 1 missing from Cunkelman either. Therefore, the combination of LaMarca with Cunkelman cannot result in a device that would render Claim 3 unpatentable under Section 103(a).

Accordingly, the Applicant's claimed device as set forth in Claim 3 is

patentable over the proposed combination of Cunkelman and LaMarca.

Claims 4, 5, and 9

The Examiner rejected Claims 4, 5, and 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cunkelman in combination with US 5,563,585 (MacDonald). The Examiner's proposed combination fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness even if the devices described in Cunkelman and MacDonald could somehow be combined.

MacDonald describes and shows a transparent housing 11 and an alarm 46 for a water pump monitor. However, the Examiner has not explained why a person of ordinary skill in the art would consider a document relating to water pumps (MacDonald) with a document relating to gas drying (Cunkelman). These are different technical fields, and there is nothing that would suggest to the skilled reader of Cunkelman that he should consider water pump technology in making an electronic control device for a gas dryer.

In any event, Claims 4, 5, and 9 depend from Claim 1 either directly or indirectly. As discussed above Cunkelman does not disclose all the features of Claim 1. MacDonald does not disclose the features of Claim 1 missing from Cunkelman. Therefore, the combination of MacDonald with Cunkelman cannot result in a device that would render Claims 4, 5, or 9 unpatentable under Section 103(a).

Accordingly, the Applicant's claimed device as set forth in any of Claims 4, 5 and 9 is patentable over the combination of MacDonald with Cunkelman.

Claim 10

The Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Cunkelman in combination with US 6,050,651 (Thomas). The Examiner's proposed

combination fails to present a *prima facie* case of obviousness even if the devices described in Cunkelman and Thomas could somehow be combined.

Thomas discloses at column 2, line 55 to column 3, line 16 a purge cycle with a time delay. However, Thomas does not disclose the use of a four core cable for operating a gas dryer, as set forth in Claim 10.

Furthermore, Claim 10 is dependent on Claim 1. As discussed above, Cunkelman does not disclose all the features of Claim 1. Thomas does not disclose the features of Claim 1 missing from Cunkelman. Thus, the combination of Thomas with Cunkelman cannot result in a device that would render Claim 10 unpatentable under Section 103(a).

Accordingly, Claim 10 is patentable over the proposed combination of Thomas with Cunkelman.